

Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education





Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



JCAP(2021), JCAP(2022), JHEP(2023), arxiv:2304.11844

Total slides: 11



Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



Collaborators





Satyabrata, SINP



Pasquale, Southampton



Kareem, Queen Mary



Yeling-Zhou, Hangzhou





Ramazanov, Prague

Will, Prague



Ambar, SINP



Federico, Prague



Borah, IITG

Suruj, IITG



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs

Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP , Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs

> Logia (I Hz The GW triangle

Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP , Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs



Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP , Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs

Logia (I Hz

The GW

triangle

JCAP 06 (2023) 019

Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education

Funds





Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP , Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs

The GW

triangle

Important: Spectral features to distinguish models

Rome Samanta, CEICO, Institute of Physics, Prague

NEHOP, Napoli, Italy



EUROPEAN UNION European Structural and Investment Funds Operational Programme Research, Development and Education



New parameter space for ordinary matter + dark matter in seesaw: Thanks to PBHs



Analysis of spectral features and search imprints of models



Formation of cosmic strings needs vacuum not simply connected: U(1) Effective potential

 $V(\Phi, T) = \frac{\lambda}{4} \Phi^4 + D(T^2 - T_0^2) \Phi^2 - ET \Phi^3,$





Examples and properties

Gauge strings: GUT models-> U(1)B-L

Global strings: axion strings

Melting strings: Feebly coupled field theories (RS et al, JCAP, 2021)

Width: $\delta w : 1/\sqrt{\lambda} v$

Tension: δ_w : G μ (v . v), G Newton Constant

Scaling regime

Long string energy, $\rho_L \approx$ background energy * $G\mu$

Cosmic strings never dominate the energy density C. J. A. P. Martins and E. P. S. Shellard, Phys. Rev. D 54, 2535-2556 (1996) Velocity dependent one-scale model

$$\frac{d\rho_{\infty}}{dt} = -2H(1+\bar{v}^2)\rho_{\infty} - \mu \int_0^\infty lf(l,t)dl$$

$$f(x) = \tilde{C}\delta(x - \alpha_L \xi),$$

$$n(\tilde{t}, l_k(\tilde{t})) = \frac{A_r}{\alpha} \frac{(\alpha + \Gamma G \mu)^{3/2}}{\left[l_k(\tilde{t}) + \Gamma G \mu \tilde{t}\right]^{5/2} \tilde{t}^{3/2}}$$

malisation: O(1)
B.Pillado et al, PRD,
2011

Needs no

$$n(\tilde{t}, l_k(\tilde{t})) = \frac{0.18}{\left[l_k(\tilde{t}) + \Gamma G \mu \tilde{t}\right]^{5/2} \tilde{t}^{3/2}}.$$

Gravitational waves from cosmic strings and spectral features

RS et al, 2304.11844

$$\Omega_{GW}^{(k)}(t_0, f) = \frac{2kG\mu^2\Gamma_k}{f\rho_c} \int_{t_F}^{t_0} \left[\frac{a(\tilde{t})}{a(t_0)}\right]^5 n\left(\tilde{t}, \frac{2k}{f}\left[\frac{a(\tilde{t})}{a(t_0)}\right]\right) d\tilde{t}.$$

Radiation



Kination



Matter





Gravitational waves from cosmic strings : Mind the sums and cuts



Gravitational waves from cosmic strings : Mind the sums and cuts



Gravitational waves from cosmic strings : Mind the sums and cuts









$$\begin{split} \Omega_{GW}(f) &= \sum_{k} k^{-\delta} \Omega^{(1)}(f/k) \\ &= 1^{-\delta} \Omega^{(1)}(f/1) + m^{-\delta} \Omega^{(1)}(f/m) + n^{-\delta} \Omega^{(1)}(f/n) + r^{-\delta} \Omega^{(1)}(f/r) + \dots, \end{split}$$

BSM models: Leptogenesis + right-handed neutrino dark matter

N1, N2, N3 : one of them is DM and other two make baryogenesis via leptogenesis

Models: **vMSM**: active-sterile oscillation

Asaka, Shaposhnikov, Blanchet, 2005

N3 : Dark matter mass keV: X-rays

RHiNO: Oscillation among N's, e.g., N₂ <-> N₃

Di Bari, Ludl, Ruiz, 2016 Di Bari, Farrag, Samanta, Zhou, 2019

N3 : Dark matter mass PeV: IceCube How heavy Ni could be ?

PBH: all of them could be super-heavy; close to GUT scale: GWs **BSM models: Leptogenesis + right-handed neutrino dark matter**

N1, N2, N3 : one of them is DM and other two make baryogenesis via leptogenesis

Models: **xMSM**: active-sterile oscillation

N3 : Dark matter mass keV: X-rays

RHiNO: Oscillation among N's, e.g., N₂ <-> N₃

N3 : Dark matter mass PeV: IceCube

How heavy Ni could be ?

PBH: all of them could be super-heavy; close to GUT scale: GWs



Мвн : -> Мом, β:-> M (lepto scale) Check also: Nicolas, Yuber, Jessica, Lucien, Andrew, Anish, Napoli group papers

PBH-seesaw mapping

GWs: Theodoros et al, JCAP(2021) Domenech et al, JCAP (2021)



Master equation:

$$\Omega_{
m GW}^{
m peak} \simeq \Omega_{
m GW}^0 \left(rac{M_1}{10^{14}~{
m GeV}}
ight)^{16/3} \left(rac{M_{
m DM}}{10^{14}~{
m GeV}}
ight)^{28/45}$$

The red-tilt frequency

$$T_{ev} = \left(\frac{45M_{Pl}^2}{16\pi^3 g_*(T_{ev})\tau^2}\right)^{1/4}.$$

$$\tau = \int_{t_{Bf}}^{t_{ev}} dt = -\int_{M_{BH}}^{0} dM_{BH} \frac{30720\pi M_{BH}^2}{\mathcal{G}g_{*B}(T_{BH})M_{Pl}^4} = \frac{10240\pi M_{BH}^3}{\mathcal{G}g_{*B}(T_{BH})M_{Pl}^4}.$$



√ μ ~ Μ_{DM}

$$f_* \simeq 2.1 \times 10^{-8} \sqrt{\frac{50}{z_{\rm eq} \alpha \Gamma G \mu}} \left(\frac{M_{DM}}{T_0}\right)^{3/5} T_0^{-2/5} t_0^{-1},$$



Why strong amplitude GWs are of interest? PTAs to LIGO

Millisecond pulsars (spins ~100 times a second) produce most stable pulses and are used by the PTAs

When a gravitational wave (a disturbance) passes through the earth and pulsar system, the time of arrival of the signal from the pulsars changes. This induces a change in frequency due to the gravitational wave.

Time residual:
$$R(t) = -\int_0^t \frac{\delta v}{v} dt$$

Pulsar-Timing-Arrays work with high amplitude GWs => Could be a Detector of High Scale Symmetry breaking theories



NANOGrav-fit

$$\Omega_{GW}(f) = \frac{2\pi^2}{3H_0^2} f^2 h_c(f)^2 = \Omega_{yr} \left(\frac{f}{f_{yr}}\right)^{5-\gamma}, \quad \text{with} \quad \Omega_{yr} = \frac{2\pi^2}{3H_0^2} A^2 f_{yr}^2.$$

RS et al, JCAP 2022





Need numerical simulation to check consistency
 Precise understanding of PBH-string interactions
 We did not consider black hole-string network that could provide spectral distortion.



Ultralight PBH dynamics (only non-rotating)

Consider formation in the radiation domination

Mass: $M_{BH} = \gamma \frac{4}{3} \pi (H_{Bf}^{-1})^3 \rho_{Bf}$ with $\rho_{Bf} = \frac{3H_{Bf}^2 M_{Pl}^2}{8\pi}$, $H_{Bf} = \frac{1}{2t_{Pf}}$. $-\frac{dM_{BH}}{dt} = f_{ev}(4\pi r_{BH}^2)\frac{dE}{dt},$ Mass loss: $\frac{dM_{BH}}{dt} = -\frac{\mathcal{G}g_{*B}(T_{BH})}{30720\pi} \frac{M_{Pl}^4}{M_{BH}^2},$ Life-time: $au = \int_{t_{Bf}}^{t_{ev}} dt = -\int_{M_{BH}}^{0} dM_{BH} \frac{30720\pi M_{BH}^2}{\mathcal{G}g_{*B}(T_{BH})M_{Pl}^4} = \frac{10240\pi M_{BH}^3}{\mathcal{G}g_{*B}(T_{BH})M_{Pl}^4}.$ $T_{ev} = \left(\frac{45M_{Pl}^2}{16\pi^3 a_{e}(T_{ev})\tau^2}\right)^{1/4}.$ Evaporation

Formation temperature

$$T_{Bf} = \left(\frac{45\gamma^2}{16\pi^3 g_*(T_{Bf})}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{M_{BH}}\right)^{1/2} M_{Pl}.$$



Constraints on black hole masses masses Free parameter

Free parameter:
$$\beta = \rho_{BH} / \rho_{rad}$$



PBH Mass

